UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/697,531 | 10/30/2003 | Frank Worden Hobbs JR. | PH 7069 DIV 1 | 7567 |

23914 7590 06/16/2004

STEPHEN B. DAVIS
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY
PATENT DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 4000
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| ROBINSON, BINTA M | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 1625 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/697,531 | HOBBS, FRANK WORDEN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Binta M. Robinson | 1625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/30/2003.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## Detailed Action

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8 and 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while providing enablement for a method of treating rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, and solid tumor growths and tumor invasions by secondary metastases where hyperactivity of the MEK-Erk pathway plays a pathogenic role, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing any disorder related to MEK, or treating all disorders related to MEK, particularly glaucoma, gingivitis, periodontitis, shock, HIV infection, corneal ulceration, multiple sclerosis, psoriasis, cardiovascular effects, hemorrhage, coagulation, cachexia, anorexia, alcoholism or in all solid tumor growths and tumor invasions by secondary metases. It is not established in the art to prevent MEK related disorders. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement. The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. The applicant is referred to ***In re Wands***, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8

USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in ***Ex parte*** Foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

**The nature of the Invention**

The nature of the invention is the treatment and prevention of MEK related disorders with the compounds of formula Ia or Ib.

**The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art**

The state of the prior art is that it is established in the art to treat cancers, arthritis, graft versus host reaction and shock, and various immune disorders, such as automimmune disease, inflammatory conditions such as organ transplant rejection and for MEK inhibitors as antiviral agents with MEK inhibitors (See Krepinsky et. al. , page 1795, and pages 1804 , Expert Opinion Therapeutic Patents, 12(12): 1795-1811, 2002). It is unpredictable in the art to treat glaucoma, multiple sclerosis, or psoriasis, hemorrhage, coagulation, cachexia, anorexia, alcoholism, acute phase response, acute infection, HIV infection with MEK inhibitors. The Raf-MEK-Erk pathway has the multiple functions of promoting cell proliferation, angiogenesis, and tumor metastasis. See page 1796 of the Krepinsky et. al. Amino-thio-acrylonitriles which are very similar to the claimed invention have been patented as MEK inhibitors. The efficacy of these compounds in inhibiting MEK1 is not known. See page 1800 of Krepinsky. However,

the characteristic feature of all potent MEK1 inhibitors, is the presence of a benzyl-bearing group at positions R1 and R2 and based on this, and on a report showing that U0124 does not inhibit MEK 1, it might be possible to predict that other substitutions in these locations would not generate good MEK1 inhibitors. Oral administration of PD 184352 inhibitor at 20, 60, and 200 mg/kg/day for 63 days reduced the incidence of arthritis. See page 1803 of the Krepinsky reference. There is also some evidence to suggest that MEK1 inhibitors may be a potential therapeutic target in Osteoarthritis. See page 1803, Krepinsky. The use of MEK inhibitors for the control of transplant rejection was patented in the year 2000. However, despite encouraging in vitro data, in vivo data has thus far been disappointing. See page 1804, Krepinksy. Pfizer also patented the use of MEK1 inhibitors in the treatment of septic shock. See page 1804 of Krepinksy. In vitro data suggest that the ERK pathway, which underlies the rationale for targeting MEK1, may be important in some of the events likely to be involved in the pathogenesis of this disorder. See page 1804 of the Krepinksy. However, no in vivo data exists yet to support or refute the efficacy of blocking MEK1 signaling in septic shock. See page 1804, Krepinsky. MEK 1 inhibitors have also been patented as antiviral agents. See Krepinsky, page 1804, however, MEK inhibitors have been found to have low efficacy as antiviral agents, which is not directly related to their ability to inhibit MEK1 activity. The Extracellular signal-regulated kinase (Erk), pathway which regulates MEK1/2, functions in many cellular processes and diseases where there have been patents and publications obtained, but is unlikely to function in all of these conditions( arthritis, organ transplant rejection, septic shock, viral infection, cancer,

chronic pain, and ischaemia. See page 1805 of Krepinsky. MEK1 inhibitors are most expected to have therapeutic value where the disruption of Erk regulation has been shown to be of importance. See page 1805 of Krepinksy.

The prior art to date, has shown that cancer therapy fits this model most closely. See page 1805 of Krepinksy. The most promising application of MEK1/2 inhibitors would be in the treatment of tumors in which hyperactivity of the MEK-Erk pathway plays a pathogenetic role. MEK inhibitors were found to have low efficacy in the treatment of both neurofibromatosis type I and implanted P388 leukemia, however they prevented the growth and development of some colon cancers and melanomas. See page 1805, Krepinsky. Both colon cancer tumors and melanomas have high levels of Erk activation. See page 1805 of Krepinsky.

MEK1/2 inhibitors show promise in the treatment of arthritis and chronic pain. See Krepinsky, page 1806.

**Breadth of the Claims**

The claims encompass treating any MEK related disorder with the compounds claimed. The complex nature of the claims is greatly exacerbated by the breadth of the claims. For example the claims encompass treating a patient with solid tumor growths and tumor invasions by secondary metastases which potentially has many different causes, each of which may or may not be addressed by the administration of MEK 1 and 2 inhibitors.

**the predictability or lack thereof in the art**

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to therapeutic effects of MEK-mediated diseases, whether the MEK was inhibited or activated would affect the possible treatment of any disease.

Hence, in the absence of a showing of correlation between all the diseases claimed as capable of treatment by the compound of claim 1 and the inhibition of MEK, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of claim 1 due to the unpredictability of the role of MEK, i.e. whether promotion or inhibition would be beneficial for the treatment of the diseases.

The nature of pharmaceutical arts is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. The state of the art is that the MEK pathway is not pivotal in all of the diseases claimed, and MEK inhibitors have been shown to have poor efficacy in several of the diseases claimed, such as Shock, graft host reaction, HIV infection, and some cancers.

**The amount of direction or guidance present**

The direction present in the instant specification is that the compounds of claim 1 can inhibit the production of MEK which helps in the treatment for arthritis, and some solid tumors where the role of MEK is pivotal. However, the specification is silent and fails to provide guidance as to whether the diseases listed as MEK-mediated diseases, require the inhibition of MEK or the activation of MEK for treatment, i.e. the specification fails to provide a correlation between the all of the diseases claimed and the inhibition of MEK. The specification does not provide any in vitro data or in vivo data of the effects of the instant compounds on MEK activity or the diseases claimed.

**The presence or absence of working examples**

There are no working examples of these compounds in terms of the in vitro or in vivo experiments analyzing these compounds' efficacy on MEK activity or the diseases claimed. The compounds which are disclosed in the specification have no pharmacological data regarding the treatment of other of the claimed diseases and have no data on the possible treatment of MEK-mediated diseases that require the promotion of MEK. Also, the specification fails to provide working examples as to how the listed diseases can be treated by the inhibition of MEK, i.e. again, there is no correlation between the diseases listed and inhibition of MEK.

**The quantity of experimentation needed**

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would need to determine what listed diseases would be benefited by the

inhibition of MEK and would furthermore then have to determine whether the claimed compounds would provide treatment of the disease by the inhibition of MEK.

**The level of the skill in the art**

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compound of the claim 1 for the treatment of any MEK-mediated disease, as a result necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which MEK-mediated diseases can be treated by the compound of claim 1 in order to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001 , states that " a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search , but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which MEK-mediated diseases can be treated by the compound encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dent et. al.

Dent et. al. discloses the instant compound, Benzeneacetonitrole, alpha-[amino[(4-aminophenyl)thio]methylene-2-(trifluoromethyl)- and pharmaceutical composition containing said compound. At column 1, lines 25-30, column 4, lines 1-37, and claim 4, column 15, see the instant compound. Also see133:344610, for the instant compound, Benzeneacetonitrole, alpha-[amino[(4-aminophenyl)thio]methylene-2-(trifluoromethyl)-.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dent et. al. based on the 102 (e) date. Dent et. al. teaches the

method of treating cancer by inhibiting MEK 1 and 2 with Taxane inhibitors. At column 15, see claim 3. The difference between the prior art method of treating cancer by inhibiting the ability of Raf to phosphorylate and activate MEK 1 and 2 and the instantly claimed method of treating cancer, is the teaching of a method of treating cancer by inhibiting MEK 1 and MEK2 with a generic taxane inhibitor versus a disclosed species. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to devise a method of treating cancer by inhibiting MEK 1 and 2 with a compound species inhibitor as opposed to any taxane inhibitor. For instance, see the method of inhibiting MEK 1 and 2 with SL327 and SW073. Accordingly, the instant method is deemed unpatentable therefrom in the absence of a showing of unexpected results for the claimed method over those of the generic prior art method.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6703420. Although the conflicting claims

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the Patent claims a subgenus of compounds of the instant compounds, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds.

U.S. Patent No. 6703420 teaches the instant compound as shown in Formula Ia or Ib; pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. At columns 33-38, see claims 1-11. The difference between the prior art compound and the instantly claimed compounds is the teaching of a generic compound versus a subgenus of compounds and a method of treating rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds, and pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select various known radicals within a genus to prepare structurally similar compounds, pharmaceutical compositions, and to devise a method of treating rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. For instance, see the compound, E and Z-alpha-[amino[(2-aminophenyl)thio]methylene]-3-[(2, 4-dinitrophenyl)hydroxymethyl]benzenacetonitrile, in claim 4, claim 34 , where a disclosed species is exemplified. Accordingly, the compounds, pharmaceutical composition, and method of treating are deemed unpatentable therefrom in the absence of a showing of unexpected results for the claimed compounds, pharmaceutical composition, and method of treating over those of the generic prior art compounds, pharmaceutical composition and method of treating.

This rejection was made because the restriction requirement made in application 09527335 was not adhered to.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

.Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hobbs et. al.

U.S. Patent No. 6703420 teaches the instant compound as shown in Formula Ia or Ib, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. At columns 33-38, see claims 1-11. The difference between the prior art compound and the instantly claimed compounds is the teaching of a generic compound versus a subgenus of compounds, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select various known radicals within a genus to prepare structurally similar compound, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. For instance, see the compound, E and Z-alpha-[amino[(2-aminophenyl)thio]methylene]-3-[(2, 4-

dinitrophenyl)hydroxymethyl]benzenacetonitrile, in claim 4, claim 34 , where a disclosed species is exemplified. Accordingly, the compounds, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds are deemed unpatentable therefrom in the absence of a showing of unexpected results for the claimed compounds, pharmaceutical composition and method of treating over those of the generic prior art compounds, pharmaceutical composition and method of treating.

Applicant has provided evidence in this file showing that the invention was owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same entity as US 6703420 at the time this invention was made. Accordingly, US 6703420 is disqualified as prior art through 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) in any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in this application. However, this applied art additionally qualifies as prior art under another subsection (e) of 35 U.S.C. 102 and accordingly is not disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Applicant may overcome the applied art either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that the invention disclosed therein was derived from the invention of this application, and is therefore, not the invention "by another," or by antedating the applied art under 37 CFR 1.131.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hobbs et. al.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2). U.S. Patent No. 6703420 teaches the instant compound as shown in Formula Ia or Ib, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. At columns 33-38, see claims 1-11. The difference between the prior art compound and the instantly claimed compounds is the teaching of a generic compound versus a subgenus of compounds, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select various known radicals within a

genus to prepare structurally similar compounds, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these compounds. For instance, see the compound, E and Z-alpha-[amino[(2-aminophenyl)thio]methylene]-3-[(2, 4-dinitrophenyl)hydroxymethyl]benzenacetonitrile, in claim 4, claim 34 , where a disclosed species is exemplified. Accordingly, the compounds are deemed unpatentable therefrom in the absence of a showing of unexpected results for the claimed compounds, pharmaceutical composition, and method of treating over those of the generic prior art compounds, pharmaceutical compositions containing said compounds, and a method of treating the rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, periodontitis, gingivitis, with these.

The IDS filed 10/30/2003 has been considered. The references that have been crossed out will not be considered until supplied to the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0692. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699.

A facsimile center has been established. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier numbers for accessing the facsimile machine are (703)308-4242, (703)305-3592, and (703)305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-1600.

BMR
June 8, 2004

JOSEPH K. McKANE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600